

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action of November 10, 2004. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-17** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed (U.S. Pat. No. 5,130,806) hereinafter referred to as Reed.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spoffard (U.S. Patent Number 6,112,235) hereinafter referred to as Spoffard.

Claims 2, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spoffard in view of Prithviraj et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,987,513) hereinafter referred to as Prithviraj.

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spoffard (U.S. Patent Number 6,112,235). Claim 1 has been amended to clarify a system that comprises an imaging device that includes a display, the display being used by the imaging device to provide status as to operation of the imaging device, and a computing system in communication with the imaging device, the computing system for obtaining news information unrelated to operation of the imaging device, and for causing the imaging device to display the news information in place of a status message. No new matter has been added since claim 16 recites a similar imaging device.

Conversely, Spoffard does not disclose any sort of imaging device with a display that displays news information unrelated to its operation on its display. Spoffard is directed to a method for remotely managing network hardware from a computer 12 using an internetwork

protocol (see abstract, col. 1, lines 50-60). The computer 12 sends management requests, like hardware status, to the hardware device 14, and the computer 12 displays the hardware status on the computer's display (see column 3, lines 5-12 and lines 20-22). Therefore, the management requests relate only to operation of the hardware device 14 (see column 3, lines 8-12).

Further, in the Office Action, it is argued that Spoffard discloses the teachings of multiple computers (Fig. 1), where one computer 12 is considered the computing system and another computer 12 is considered the office equipment of claim 1. Claim 1, however, has been amended to claim an imaging device. As a computer 12 is not an imaging device this argument is now moot (see column 2, lines 10-14). Finally, as previously argued, the managed network hardware 14 as described by Spoffard does not and cannot display information because it has no display terminal as described in column 2, lines 19-21. This is contrary to requirements of claim 1.

Since **claim 1** recites features not taught or suggested by Spoffard, **claim 1** patentably distinguishes over Spoffard. Accordingly, dependent **claims 2-5** also patentably distinguish over Spoffard and are in condition for allowance.

Regarding Reed (U.S. Pat. No. 5,130,806), Reed is directed to job comment/operator messages for an electronic reprographic printing system. Although Reed was not applied to claim 1, Applicant believes claim 1 distinguishes over Reed in view of the present amendments. As described in more detail with reference to claim 16, Reed fails to teach or suggest the recited imaging device and computing system for causing the imaging device to display news information in place of a status message. Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Reed and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 6

Independent claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spoffard (U.S. Patent Number 6,112,235). Claim 6 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 1. As previously argued Spoffard does not disclose an imaging device with a display that displays information unrelated to its operation on its display. Therefore, the reasoning that

supports the anticipation rejection fails to properly anticipate claim 6 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Since claim 6 recites features not taught or suggested by Spoffard, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over Spoffard. Accordingly, dependent **claims 8-10** also patentably distinguish over Spoffard and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 16

Independent claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed (U.S. Pat. No. 5,130,806). Reed, however, is directed to job comment/operator messages for an electronic reprographic printing system. As stated in column 6, lines 60-69 of Reed, the messages displayed are from the users and relate in some form to the operation of the reprographic printing system. More specifically, as stated in column 7, lines 4-7, the messages sent relate to instructions to the operator to print on certain paper, “such as pages with a company logo or a special stock.” Additionally, as stated in column 7, lines 34-37, the messages sent relate to instructions to the operator to finish the print job, “stapling, stitching, binding, wrapping, trimming, folding, etc.” These are all messages that relate to the operation of the printing system.

Thus, Reed is only concerned with messages relating to the operation of the imaging device. This is directly contrary to the requirements of claim 16 that the imaging device displays information unrelated to the operations of the imaging device. As such, Reed fails to teach or suggest an imaging device being configured to receive instructions from a computing device that causes the imaging device to display information unrelated to the operation of the imaging device.

Since claim 16 recites features not taught or suggested by Reed, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over Reed. Accordingly, dependent **claim 17** also patentably distinguishes over Reed and is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Finally, the Office Action rejects **claims 2, 7, and 12** under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spoffard in view of Prithviraj et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,987,513). Claim 12 as been canceled. As stated above, independent claims 1 and 6 recite features not taught or suggested by Spoffard. Therefore, depending claims 2 and 7 recite features not taught or suggested by the combination of Spoffard in view of Prithviraj. Accordingly, dependent claims 2 and 7 patentably distinguish over Spoffard in view of Prithviraj and are in condition for allowance.

Present Amendment Should Be Entered


Applicant believes that the present amendments place the claims in condition for allowance or at least in better form for appeal. Thus, Applicant requests that the present amendments be entered.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-10 and 16-17** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JAN. 10, 2005
Date


PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)
(216) 348-5843